arXiv:1501.01569v2 [math.CA] 19 Jan 2015

CHARACTERIZATION OF n-RECTIFIABILITY IN TERMS OF JONES' SQUARE FUNCTION: PART I

XAVIER TOLSA

Abstract. In this paper it is shown that if μ is a finite Radon measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is n-rectifiable and $1 \leq p \leq 2$, then

$$\int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,p}^n(x,r)^2 \,\frac{dr}{r} < \infty \qquad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where

$$\beta_{\mu,p}^n(x,r) = \inf_L \left(\frac{1}{r^n}\int_{\bar{B}(x,r)} \left(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(y,L)}{r}\right)^p d\mu(y)\right)^{1/p},$$

with the infimum taken over all the n-planes $L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The $\beta_{\mu,p}^n$ coefficients are the same as the ones considered by David and Semmes in the setting of the so called uniform n-rectifiability. An analogous necessary condition for n-rectifiability in terms of other coefficients involving some variant of the Wasserstein distance W_1 is also proved.

1. Introduction

A set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called n-rectifiable if there are Lipschitz maps $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that

$$\mathcal{H}^n\left(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bigcup_i f_i(\mathbb{R}^n)\right) = 0,$$

where $\mathcal{H}^n$ stands for the n-dimensional Hausdorff measure. On the other hand, one says that a Radon measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is n-rectifiable if μ vanishes out of an n-rectifiable set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and moreover μ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{H}^n|_E$.

One of the main objectives of geometric measure theory consist in obtaining different characterizations of n-rectifiability. For example, there are classical characterizations in terms of the existence of approximate tangents, in terms of the existence of densities, or in terms

---

The author was supported by the ERC grant 320501 of the European Research Council (FP7/2007-2013) and also partially supported by the grants 2014-SGR-75 (Catalonia) and MTM2013-44304-P (Spain).

of the size of orthogonal projections. For the precise statements and proofs of these nice results the reader is referred to [Ma].

More recently, the development of quantitative rectifiability in the pioneering works of Jones [Jo] and David and Semmes [DS1] has led to the study of the connection between rectifiability and the boundedness of square functions and singular integrals (for instance, see [Da], [Lé], [NToV] or [CGLT]). Many results on this subject deal with the so called uniform n-rectifiability introduced by David and Semmes [DS2] One says that μ is uniformly n-rectifiable if it is n-AD-regular, that is $c^{-1}r^n \leq \mu(B(x,r)) \leq c\,r^n$ for all $x \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$, $r>0$ and some constant $c>0$, and further there exist constants $\theta, M>0$ so that, for each $x \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$ and $R>0$, there is a Lipschitz mapping g from the n-dimensional ball $B_n(0,r) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that g has Lipschitz norm not exceeding M and

$$\mu\big(B(x,r) \cap g(B_n(0,r))\big) \geq \theta r^n.$$

To state one of the main result of [DS1] we need to introduce some additional notation. Given $1<p<\infty$, a closed ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and an integer $0<n<d$, let

$$\beta^n_{\mu,p}(B) = \inf_L \left(\frac{1}{r(B)^n} \int_B \left(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(y,L)}{r(B)} \right)^p d\mu(y) \right)^{1/p},$$

where the infimum is taken over all the n-planes $L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Quite often, given a fixed n, to simplify notation we will drop the exponent n and we will write $\beta_{\mu,p}(x,r)$ instead of $\beta^n_{\mu,p}(\bar{B}(x,r))$. The aforementioned result from [DS1] is the following.

Theorem A. *Let $1 \leq p < 2n/(n-2)$. Let μ be an n-AD-regular Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The measure μ is uniformly n-rectifiable if and only if there exists some constant $c>0$ such that*

$$\int_{B(x,r)} \int_0^r \beta^n_{\mu,p}(y,r)^2 \,\frac{dr}{r}\, d\mu(y) \leq c\,r^n \quad \textit{for all } x \in \operatorname{supp}\mu \textit{ and all } r>0.$$

In the case $n=1$, a result analogous to this one in terms of L^∞ versions of the coefficients $\beta_{\mu,p}$ is also valid, even without the n-AD-regularity assumption on μ, as shown previously by Jones in his traveling salesman theorem [Jo].

Other coefficients which involve a variant of the Wasserstein distance W_1 in the spirit of the $\beta_{\mu,p}$'s have been introduced in [To1] and have shown to be useful in the study of different questions regarding the connection between uniform n-rectifiability and the boundedness of n-dimensional singular integral operators (see [To2] or [MT], for example). Given two finite Borel measures σ, μ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and a closed ball

$B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we set

$$\operatorname{dist}_B(\sigma, \mu) := \sup\Big\{\Big|\textstyle\int f\,d\sigma - \int f\,d\mu\Big| : \operatorname{Lip}(f) \leq 1,\, \operatorname{supp}(f) \subset B\Big\},$$

where $\operatorname{Lip}(f)$ stands for the Lipschitz constant of f. We also set

$$\alpha_\mu^n(B) = \frac{1}{r(B)^{n+1}} \inf_{a \geq 0, L} \operatorname{dist}_{3B}(\mu,\, a\mathcal{H}_L^n),$$

where the infimum is taken over all the constants $a \geq 0$ and all the n-planes L which intersect B. Again we will drop the exponent n and we will write $\alpha_\mu(x,r)$ instead of $\alpha_\mu^n(\bar{B}(x,r))$ to simplify the notation.

In [To1] the following is proved:

Theorem B. *Let μ be an n-AD-regular Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The measure μ is uniformly n-rectifiable if and only if there exists some constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{B(x,r)} \int_0^r \alpha_\mu^n(y,r)^2 \frac{dr}{r}\, d\mu(y) \leq c\, r^n \quad \text{for all } x \in \operatorname{supp}\mu \text{ and all } r > 0.$$

In recent years there has been considerable interest in the field of geometric measure theory to obtain appropriate versions of Theorem A and Theorem B which apply to n-rectifiable measures which are not n-AD-regular. The need for such results is specially notorious in the case $n > 1$, where there is no analogous of Jones' traveling salesman mentioned above. The current paper contributes to fill in this gap by means of the following theorem, which provides necessary conditions for n-rectifiability in terms of the $\beta_{\mu,p}$ coefficients.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $1 \leq p \leq 2$. Let μ be a finite Borel measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is n-rectifiable. Then*

$$\int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,p}^n(x,r)^2 \frac{dr}{r} < \infty \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.1}$$

The integral on the left hand side of (1.1) quite often is called Jones' square function. In the sequel [AT] of the present work, by Azzam and the author of the present paper, it is shown that the finiteness of Jones' square function for $p = 2$ implies n-rectifiability. The precise result is the following:

Let μ be a finite Borel measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$0 < \limsup_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{r^n} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,2}^n(x,r)^2 \frac{dr}{r} < \infty \tag{1.2}$$

for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then μ is n-rectifiable.

So we have:

Corollary 1.2 ([AT])**.** *Let μ be a finite Borel measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $0 < \limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{r^n} < \infty$ for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then μ is n-rectifiable if and only if*

$$\int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,2}^n(x,r)^2 \,\frac{dr}{r} < \infty \qquad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.3}$$

In particular, a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mathcal{H}^n(E) < \infty$ is n-rectifiable if and only if (1.3) *holds for $\mu = \mathcal{H}^n|_E$.*

The second result that is obtained in the current paper is the following.

Theorem 1.3. *Let μ be a finite Borel measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is n-rectifiable. Then*

$$\int_0^\infty \alpha_\mu^n(x,r)^2 \,\frac{dr}{r} < \infty \qquad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This theorem can be considered as a version for non-AD-regular measures of Theorem B above.

Let us remark that Theorem 1.1 has already been proved by Pajot [Pa] under the additional assumption that μ is n-AD-regular, for $1 \leq p < n/(n-2)$. Further, in the same paper he has obtained the following partial converse:

Theorem C. *Let $1 \leq p < n/(n-2)$. Suppose that $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is compact and that $\mu = \mathcal{H}^n|E$ is finite. If*

$$\liminf_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{r^n} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,p}^n(x,r)^2 \,\frac{dr}{r} < \infty$$

for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then E is n-rectifiable.

Notice that in the above theorem the lower density $\liminf_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{r^n}$ is required to be positive, while in (1.2) it is the upper density which must be positive. Recall that the assumption that the upper density is positive μ-a.e. is satisfied for all measures of the form $\mu = \mathcal{H}^n|E$, with $\mathcal{H}^n(E) < \infty$. On the contrary, the lower density may be zero μ-a.e. for this type of measures.

Quite recently, Badger and Schul [BS2] have shown that Theorem C also holds for other measures different from Hausdorff measures, namely for Radon measures μ satisfying $\mu \ll \mathcal{H}^n$. However, their extension of Pajot's theorem still requires the lower density $\liminf_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{r^n}$ to be positive μ-a.e.

To describe another previous result of Badger and Schul [BS1] we need to introduce some additional terminology. We say that μ is n-rectifiable in the sense of Federer if there are Lipschitz maps $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that

$$\mu\biggl(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bigcup_i f_i(\mathbb{R}^n)\biggr) = 0.$$

The condition that μ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{H}^n$ is not required.

Given a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, denote

$$\widetilde{\beta}^n_{\mu,2}(Q) = \inf_L \left(\frac{1}{\mu(3Q)} \int_{3Q} \left(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(y, L)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^2 d\mu(y)\right)^{1/2},$$

where $\ell(Q)$ stands for the side length of Q and the infimum is taken over all n-planes $L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The result of Badger and Schul in [BS1] reads as follows:

Theorem D. *If μ is a locally finite Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is 1-rectifiable in the sense of Federer, then*

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}: x\in Q, \ell(Q)\leq 1} \widetilde{\beta}^1_{\mu,2}(Q)^2 \,\frac{\ell(Q)}{\mu(Q)} < \infty \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ stands for the lattice of dyadic cubes of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

According to [BS1], Peter Jones conjectured in 2000 that some condition in the spirit of (1.4) should be necessary and sufficient for n-rectifiability (in the sense of Federer). Observe that from Theorem 1.1 it follows easily that if μ is n-rectifiable (in the sense that $\mu \ll \mathcal{H}^n$), then

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}: x\in Q, \ell(Q)\leq 1} \widetilde{\beta}^n_{\mu,2}(Q)^2 < \infty \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.5}$$

Notice that Theorem D is only proved in the case $n = 1$. As remarked by the authors in [BS1], it is not clear how one could extend their techniques to the case $n > 1$. However, in contrast to Theorem 1.1 their result has the advantage that it applies to measures that need not be absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{H}^1$.

For another work in connection with rectifiability and other variants of the β_2 coefficients, we suggest the reader to see Lerman's work [Ler], and for two recent papers which involve some variants of the α coefficients without the AD-regularity assumption, see [ADT1] and [ADT2].

The plan of the paper is the following. First we prove Theorem 1.3 in Section 2. We carry out this task by combining suitable stopping time arguments with the application of Theorem B to the particular case when μ is n-dimensional Hausdorff measure on an n-dimensional Lipschitz graph. Finally, we show in Section 3 that Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 1.3 by means of other stopping time arguments. Both in Theorem 1.1 and 1.3, the stopping time arguments are mainly used to control the oscillations of the density of μ at different scales.

In this paper the letters c, C stand for some absolute constants which may change their values at different occurrences. On the other hand, constants with subscripts, such as c_1, do not change their values at different occurrences. The notation $A \lesssim B$ means that there is some fixed constant c (usually an absolute constant) such that $A \leq c\,B$. Further, $A \approx B$ is equivalent to $A \lesssim B \lesssim A$. We will also write $A \lesssim_{c_1} B$ if we want to make explicit the dependence on the constants c_1 of the relationship "$\lesssim$".

2. The proof of Theorem 1.3

2.1. **The Main Lemma.** In this section we will prove the following:

Lemma 2.1 (Main Lemma)**.** *Let μ be a finite Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an n-dimensional Lipschitz graph in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then*

$$\int_0^\infty \alpha_\mu(x,r)^2\,\frac{dr}{r} < \infty \qquad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \Gamma.$$

It is clear that Theorem 1.3 follows as a corollary of the preceding result, taking into account that if μ is n-rectifiable, then it is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{H}^n$ restricted to a countable union of (possibly rotated) n-dimensional Lipschitz graphs.

In the remaining of this section we assume that μ is a finite Borel measure and Γ is an n-dimensional Lipschitz graph, as in Lemma 2.1.

2.2. **The exceptional set H.** We intend now to define an exceptional set H which will contain the balls centered at Γ with too much mass. The precise definition is as follows. Let $M \gg 1$ be some constant to be fixed below. Let H_0 be the family of points $x \in \Gamma$ such that there exists a ball $B(x,r)$ such that

$$\mu(B(x,r)) \geq M\,r^n.$$

For $x \in H_0$, denote by r_x a radius such that

$$\mu(B(x,r_x)) \geq M\,r_x^n \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mu(B(x,r)) \leq M\,r^n \quad \text{for all } r \geq 2r_x.$$

By the $5r$ covering theorem, we can cover H_0 by a family of balls $B(x_i, 5\, r_{x_i})$, $i \in I_H$, with $x_i \in H_0$, so that the balls $B(x_i, r_{x_i})$, $i \in I_H$, are pairwise disjoint. We denote $\Delta_i = B(x_i, 5r_{x_i})$ and we set

$$H = H(M) = \bigcup_{i \in I_H} \Delta_i.$$

Note that

$$M \leq \frac{\mu(\frac{1}{5}\Delta_i)}{r(\frac{1}{5}\Delta_i)^n} \leq 5^n \, \frac{\mu(\Delta_i)}{r(\Delta_i)^n} \leq 5^n M. \tag{2.1}$$

Also, observe that any ball B centered on Γ which is not contained in H satisfies

$$\mu(B) \leq M\, r(B)^n.$$

For technical reasons it is also convenient to introduce the sets H^k, for $k \geq 1$:

$$H^k = H^k(M) = \bigcup_{i \in I_H} k\Delta_i, \tag{2.2}$$

where $k\Delta_i$ is the ball concentric with Δ_i with radius $k\, r(\Delta_i)$. Obviously, we have $H \subset H^k$.

Lemma 2.2. *For any positive integer k, we have*

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} \mathcal{H}^n(H^k(M) \cap \Gamma) = 0.$$

Proof. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote

$$\mathcal{M}_n\mu(x) := \sup_{r>0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{r^n}.$$

It is well known that $\mathcal{M}_n$ is bounded from the space of real Radon measures $M(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $L^{1,\infty}(\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)$. Then it follows that

$$\mathcal{M}_n\mu(x) < \infty \quad \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \Gamma. \tag{2.3}$$

Let $x \in H^k$, so that $x \in k\Delta_i$ for some $i \in I_H$. By (2.1) we have

$$\frac{\mu(B(x,(k+1)r(\Delta_i))}{((k+1)\, r(\Delta_i))^n} \geq \frac{\mu(\Delta_i)}{((k+1)\, r(\Delta_i))^n} \geq \frac{M}{5^n(k+1)^n},$$

and thus $\mathcal{M}_n\mu(x) > 10^{-n}M$. Hence we infer that

$$H^k \subset \big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathcal{M}_n\mu(x) > 5^{-n}\,(k+1)^{-n}M\big\},$$

and so

$$\mathcal{H}^n(H^k(M) \cap \Gamma) \leq \mathcal{H}^n\big(\big\{x \in \Gamma : \mathcal{M}_n\mu(x) > 5^{-n}(k+1)^{-n}M\big\}\big) \to 0$$

as $M \to \infty$, by (2.3). □

From now we will allow the constants c in the estimates below to depend on M.

2.3. The Whitney cubes and the approximating measure σ.

Let $A : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d-n}$ be the function whose Lipschitz graph is Γ. Consider now a decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Gamma$ into a family $\mathcal{W}$ of dyadic Whitney cubes. That is, $\mathcal{W}$ is a collection of dyadic cubes with disjoint interiors such that

$$\bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{W}} Q = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Gamma,$$

and moreover there are some constants $R > 20$ and $D_0 \geq 1$ such the following holds for every $Q \in \mathcal{W}$:

(i) $10Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Gamma$;
(ii) $RQ \cap \Gamma \neq \varnothing$;
(iii) there are at most D_0 cubes $Q' \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $10Q \cap 10Q' \neq \varnothing$. Further, for such cubes Q', we have $\ell(Q') \approx \ell(Q)$.

From the properties (i) and (ii) it is clear that $\mathrm{dist}(Q, \Gamma) \approx \ell(Q)$. We assume that the Whitney cubes are small enough so that

$$\mathrm{diam}(Q) < \mathrm{dist}(Q, \Gamma). \tag{2.4}$$

This can be achieved by replacing each cube $Q \in \mathcal{W}$ by its descendants $P \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)$, for some fixed $k \geq 1$, if necessary. From (2.4) we infer that if $Q \in \mathcal{W}$ intersects some ball $B(y, r)$ with $y \in \Gamma$, then

$$\mathrm{diam}(Q) \leq r, \tag{2.5}$$

and thus

$$Q \subset B(y, 3r). \tag{2.6}$$

We denote $\mathcal{W}_G$ the subfamily of the cubes from $\mathcal{W}$ which are disjoint from H. The subindex G stands for "good". It is straightforward to check that

$$\mu(Q) \leq c\, M\, \ell(Q)^n \quad \text{if } Q \in \mathcal{W}_G. \tag{2.7}$$

Notice also that if $Q \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \mathcal{W}_G$, then there exists some ball Δ_i, $i \in I_H$, such that $Q \cap \Delta_i \neq \varnothing$, and thus, by (2.5) and (2.6),

$$\mathrm{diam}(Q) \leq \mathrm{dist}(Q, \Gamma) \leq r(\Delta_i) \qquad \text{and} \qquad Q \subset 3\Delta_i. \tag{2.8}$$

With each cube $Q \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \mathcal{W}_G$ we associate a ball Δ_i such that $Q \cap \Delta_i \neq \varnothing$, and we write $Q \sim \Delta_i$. The choice does not matter if the ball Δ_i is not unique.

Lemma 2.3. *There exists a family of non-negative functions g_Q, for $Q \in \mathcal{W}_G$, which verify the following properties:*

(a) $\operatorname{supp} g_Q \subset \Gamma \cap \bar{B}(x_Q, A\,\ell(Q))$, *for some constant A depending at most on n and d.*
(b) $\int g_Q \, d\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma = \mu(Q)$.
(c) *there exists some constant c_1 depending at most on n and d such that the function*

$$g_0 := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{W}_G} g_Q \tag{2.9}$$

satisfies $\|g_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)} \leq c_1\, M$.

Proof. We denote by $\mathcal{W}_G^j$ the cubes from $\mathcal{W}_G$ which have side length 2^{-j}.

We will construct the functions g_Q as weak limits of other functions g_Q^k. For a fixed $k \geq 1$, we set

$$g_Q^k = 0 \qquad \text{for } Q \in \bigcup_{j \geq k+1} \mathcal{W}_G^j.$$

For $j \leq k$, we will define the functions g_Q^j inductively, starting with the functions g_Q^k associated with the cubes $Q \in \mathcal{W}_G^k$, then the functions g_Q^k associated with the cubes from in $\mathcal{W}_G^{k-1}$, then the functions g_Q^k associated with the cubes from $\mathcal{W}_G^{k-2}$, etc.

To define g_Q^k for $Q \in \mathcal{W}_G^k$ we consider the ball

$$\widetilde{B}_Q = B(x_Q, A\,\ell(Q)),$$

where A is some absolute constant such that $B(x_Q, \frac{1}{2} A\,\ell(Q)) \cap \Gamma \neq \varnothing$, which in particular ensures that

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma \cap \widetilde{B}_Q) \geq c^{-1}\, \ell(Q)^n. \tag{2.10}$$

Then we define

$$g_Q^k = \frac{\mu(Q)}{\mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma \cap \widetilde{B}_Q)}\, \chi_{\Gamma \cap \widetilde{B}_Q}.$$

So by (2.10) and the fact that Q is good cube, $\|g_Q^k\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{H}^n \lfloor \Gamma \cap \widetilde{B}_Q)} \leq c$, and by the finite superposition of the balls $\widetilde{B}_Q$, $Q \in \mathcal{W}_G^k$, we get

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{W}_G^k} g_Q^k \leq c_2. \tag{2.11}$$

Suppose now that we have already defined the functions g_Q^k for the cubes $Q \in \mathcal{W}_G^i$, with $i = k, k-1, \ldots, j$, so that $\operatorname{supp} g_Q^k \subset \Gamma \cap$

$\bar{B}(x_Q, A\,\ell(Q))$ and $\int g_Q^k\, d\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma = \mu(Q)$. To construct g_R^k, for $R \in \mathcal{W}_G^{j-1}$, we consider the set

$$E_R = \left\{ x \in \Gamma \cap \widetilde{B}_R : \sum_{j\leq i\leq k} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{W}_G^i} g_Q^k \leq \lambda \right\},$$

where λ is some positive constant to be fixed below. By Chebychev, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^n\big(\Gamma\cap\widetilde{B}_R\setminus E_R\big) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{\widetilde{B}_R} \sum_{j\leq i\leq k} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{W}_G^i} g_Q^k\, d\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{j\leq i\leq k} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{W}_G^i} \mu(Q\cap\widetilde{B}_R). \tag{2.12}$$

Since all the cubes $Q \in \mathcal{W}_G^i$ which intersect $\widetilde{B}_R$, with $j \leq i \leq k$, are contained in $t\widetilde{B}_R$, where $t > 1$ is some absolute constant, we get

$$\mathcal{H}^n\big(\Gamma \cap \widetilde{B}_R \setminus E_R\big) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\,\mu(t\widetilde{B}_R).$$

On the other hand, from (2.12) it is clear that $\mathcal{H}^n\big(\Gamma\cap\widetilde{B}_R\setminus E_R\big)$ vanishes unless there exists some good cube $Q_0 \in \mathcal{W}_G$ which intersects $\widetilde{B}_R$. This implies that

$$\mu\big(t\widetilde{B}_R\big) \leq c\,M\,t\,\ell(R)^n.$$

Indeed, if $\widetilde{B}'_Q$ is some ball centered on Γ which contains $t\widetilde{B}_Q$ (and thus Q_0) with $r(\widetilde{B}'_Q) \leq 2t\,r(\widetilde{B}_Q)$, then $\mu\big(t\widetilde{B}_R\big) \leq \mu(\widetilde{B}'_Q) \leq M\,r(\widetilde{B}'_Q)^n$ because $Q_0 \not\subset H$, which proves the claim. Then we deduce that

$$\mathcal{H}^n\big(\Gamma \cap \widetilde{B}_R \setminus E_R\big) \leq \frac{c\,M\,t}{\lambda}\,\ell(R)^n \leq \frac{c_3\,M\,t}{\lambda}\,\mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma \cap \widetilde{B}_R).$$

As a consequence, if we choose $\lambda = 2\,c_3\,M\,t$, we get

$$\mathcal{H}^n(E_R) \geq \frac{1}{2}\,\mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma \cap \widetilde{B}_R) \geq c\,\ell(R)^n. \tag{2.13}$$

We define

$$g_R^k = \frac{\mu(R)}{\mathcal{H}^n(E_R)}\,\chi_{E_R}.$$

From (2.7), we know that $\mu(R) \leq c\,\ell(R)^n$, and then from (2.13) it follows that

$$g_R^k \leq \frac{c\,M\,\ell(R)^n}{\ell(R)^n}\,\chi_{E_R} = c\,\chi_{E_R}.$$

From the fact that $E_R \subset \widetilde{B}_R$, it turns out that the sets E_R, for $R \in \mathcal{W}_G^{j-1}$, have finite superposition. Thus,

$$\sum_{R\in\mathcal{W}_G^{j-1}} g_R^k \leq c_4\,\chi_{\bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{W}_G^{j-1}} E_R}.$$

On the other hand, by definition

$$\sum_{j\leq i\leq k}\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{W}_G^i} g_Q^k(x)\leq\lambda\qquad\text{for all } x\in\textstyle\bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{W}_G^{j-1}} E_R.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{j-1\leq i\leq k}\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{W}_G^i} g_Q^k(x)\leq\lambda+c_4\qquad\text{for all } x\in\textstyle\bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{W}_G^{j-1}} E_R. \tag{2.14}$$

Notice also that

$$\sum_{j-1\leq i\leq k}\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{W}_G^i} g_Q^k(x)=\sum_{j\leq i\leq k}\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{W}_G^i} g_Q^k(x)\qquad\text{for } x\notin\textstyle\bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{W}_G^{j-1}} E_R. \tag{2.15}$$

Arguing by induction, from the conditions (2.11), (2.14) and (2.15) it follows easily that the functions g_Q^k satisfy

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{W}_G} g_Q^k\leq\max\bigl(c_2,c_4+\lambda\bigr).$$

To get the functions g_Q, $Q\in\mathcal{W}_G$, we will take weak limits in $L^\infty(\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)$. Suppose that the cubes from $\mathcal{W}_G$ are ordered, so that $\mathcal{W}_G=\{Q_1,Q_2,\ldots\}$. Consider a partial subsequence $\{g_{Q_1}^k\}_{k\in I_1}\subset\{g_{Q_1}^k\}_{k\geq1}$ which converges weakly to some function $g_{Q_1}\in L^\infty(\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)$. Now take another subsequence $\{g_{Q_2}^k\}_{k\in I_2}\subset\{g_{Q_2}^k\}_{k\in I_1}$ which converges weakly to $g_{Q_2}\in L^\infty(\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)$, and so on. By construction, the functions g_Q, $Q\in\mathcal{W}_G$, satisfy the properties (a) and (b) in the lemma. Also, (c) is fulfilled. Indeed, for any k and any fixed N we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N g_{Q_i}^k\leq c.$$

So letting $k\to\infty$, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^N g_{Q_i}\leq c$$

uniformly on N, which proves (c). □

Assume that $I_H=\{1,2,\ldots\}$. For $i\in I_H$ we denote

$$\widetilde\Delta_i=\Delta_i\setminus\bigcup_{j<i}\Delta_j,$$

so that

$$H=\bigcup_{i\in I_H}\widetilde\Delta_i$$

and the sets $\widetilde{\Delta}_i$, $i \in I_H$, are pairwise disjoint.

Lemma 2.4. *For each $i \in I_H$ there exists a non-negative function h_i which satisfies the following properties:*

(a) $\operatorname{supp} h_i \subset \Gamma \cap \frac{1}{5}\Delta_i$.

(b) $\int h_i \, d\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma = \mu(\widetilde{\Delta}_i \cap \Gamma) + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \mathcal{W}_G : Q \sim \Delta_i} \mu(Q)$.

(c) $\|h_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)} \leq c_5 \, M$.

Proof. For $i \in I_H$ we set

$$F_i = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \mathcal{W}_G : Q \sim \Delta_i} Q.$$

If Q is as above, then $Q \subset 3\Delta_i$, by (2.6). Therefore,

$$\mu(F_i) \leq \mu(3\Delta_i) \lesssim M \, r(\Delta_i)^n \approx M \, \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma \cap \tfrac{1}{5}\Delta_i).$$

So if we let

$$h_i = \frac{\mu(\widetilde{\Delta}_i \cap \Gamma) + \mu(F_i)}{\mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma \cap \frac{1}{5}\Delta_i)} \, \chi_{\Gamma \cap \frac{1}{5}\Delta_i},$$

the lemma follows. □

We consider the function

$$g = g_0 + \sum_{i \in I_H} h_i.$$

Recall that g_0 has been defined in (2.9). Since the functions h_i, $i \in I_H$, have disjoint supports, it is clear that

$$\|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)} \leq (c_1 + c_5) \, M.$$

We also take the following measure:

$$\sigma = \mu \lfloor \Gamma \setminus H + g \; \mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma.$$

In a sense, σ should be considered as an approximation of μ which is supported on Γ.

2.4. **The α-coefficients of μ on the good Γ-cubes.**

We consider the following "Γ-cubes" associated with Γ: we say that $Q \subset \Gamma$ is a Γ-cube if it is a subset of the form $Q = \Gamma \cap (Q_0 \times \mathbb{R}^{d-n})$, where $Q_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an n-dimensional cube. We denote $\ell(Q) := \ell(Q_0)$. We say that Q is a dyadic Γ-cube if Q_0 is a dyadic cube. The center of Q is the point $x_Q = (x_{Q_0}, A(x_{Q_0}))$, where x_{Q_0} is the center of Q_0 and $A : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d-n}$ is the function that defines Γ. The collection of dyadic Γ-cubes Q with $\ell(Q) = 2^{-j}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma,j}$. Also, we set $\mathcal{D}_\Gamma = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma,j}$ and

$\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^k = \bigcup_{j\geq k}\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma,j}$. We denote by $\mathcal{D}_\Gamma(R)$ the collection of the Γ-cubes from $\mathcal{D}_\Gamma$ which are contained in R.

The collection of the "good" dyadic Γ-cubes, which we denote by $\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$, consists of the Γ-cubes $Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma$ such that

$$Q \not\subset \bigcup_{i\in I_H} 9\Delta_i = H^9$$

(recall the definition of H^k in (2.2)). In particular, if $Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$, then $Q\not\subset H$. We also denote $\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)=\mathcal{D}_\Gamma(R)\cap\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$.

Given a Γ-cube Q, we denote by B_Q a closed ball concentric with Q with $r(B_Q)=3\mathrm{diam}(Q)$. Note that B_Q contains Q and is centered on Γ. We set

$$\alpha_\mu(Q) := \alpha_\mu(B_Q).$$

The main objective of this subsection is to prove the following.

Lemma 2.5. *There exists some constant c such that for every $R\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma$,*

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)} \alpha_\mu(Q)^2\,\ell(Q)^n \leq c\,\ell(R)^n.$$

Observe that the sum above runs only over the *good* cubes $Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)$. For the proof we need first a couple of auxiliary results.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$. Let $P\in\mathcal{W}\setminus\mathcal{W}_G$ be such that $P\cap B_Q\neq\varnothing$. If $P\sim\Delta_i$, then*

$$\ell(P)\leq r(\Delta_i)\leq c\,\ell(Q) \tag{2.16}$$

and

$$P\subset 3\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q. \tag{2.17}$$

Recall that $P\in\mathcal{W}\setminus\mathcal{W}_G$ means that P is a Whitney cube such that $P\cap H\neq\varnothing$, while $Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$ means that Q is a cube from $\mathcal{D}_\Gamma$ such that $Q\not\subset H^9$.

Proof. The first inequality in (2.16) and the first inclusion in (2.17) have been proved in (2.8).

From the fact that $P\subset 3\Delta_i$ we infer that $3\Delta_i\cap B_Q\neq\varnothing$. Suppose that $r(B_Q)\leq r(3\Delta_i)$. This would imply that $B_Q\subset 9\Delta_i$ and so $Q\subset 9\Delta_i$, which contradicts the fact that $Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$. So we deduce that

$$r(B_Q) > r(3\Delta_i),$$

which implies that $3\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q$ and also the second inequality in (2.16). □

Lemma 2.7. *If $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$, then*

$$\alpha_\mu(Q) \leq \alpha_\sigma(Q) + c\int_{3B_Q} \frac{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)}{\ell(Q)^{n+1}}\,d\mu(x) + c \sum_{i\in I_H:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} \left(\frac{r(\Delta_i)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{n+1}.$$

Recall that

$$\sigma = \mu\lfloor\Gamma\setminus H + g\,\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma. \tag{2.18}$$

Proof. Let φ be a 1-Lipschitz function supported on B_Q. Consider $c_Q \geq 0$ and an n-plane L_Q which minimize $\alpha_\sigma(Q)$. Then we write

$$\left|\int \varphi\,d\mu - c_Q\int\varphi\,d\mathcal{H}^1_{L_Q}\right| \leq \left|\int\varphi\,d(\mu-\sigma)\right| + \left|\int\varphi\,d(\sigma - c_Q\,\mathcal{H}^1_{L_Q})\right|. \tag{2.19}$$

Observe that the last integral on the right hand side does not exceed $\alpha_\sigma(Q)\,\ell(Q)^{n+1}$. To estimate the first term on the right hand side, using (2.18) we set

$$\mu-\sigma = \mu\lfloor(\Gamma\setminus H)^c - g\,\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma = \mu\lfloor(\Gamma\setminus H)^c - \sum_{P\in\mathcal{W}_G} g_P\,\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma - \sum_{i\in I_H} h_i\,\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma.$$

As in Lemma 2.4, for $i\in I_H$ we denote

$$F_i = \bigcup_{P\in\mathcal{W}:P\sim\Delta_i} P,$$

and further we set

$$\widetilde{F}_i = (\widetilde{\Delta}_i\cap\Gamma)\cup F_i.$$

We split $\mu\lfloor(\Gamma\setminus H)^c$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\lfloor(\Gamma\setminus H)^c &= \sum_{P\in\mathcal{W}_G}\mu\lfloor P + \sum_{i\in I_H}\mu(\widetilde{\Delta}_i\cap\Gamma) + \sum_{i\in I_H}\ \sum_{P\in\mathcal{W}\setminus\mathcal{W}_G:P\sim\Delta_i}\mu\lfloor P\\ &= \sum_{P\in\mathcal{W}_G}\mu\lfloor P + \sum_{i\in I_H}\mu\lfloor\widetilde{F}_i.\end{aligned}$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int\varphi\,d(\mu-\sigma)\right| \leq& \sum_{P\in\mathcal{W}_G}\left|\int\varphi\,d(\mu\lfloor P - g_P\,\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)\right|\\ &+\sum_{i\in I_H}\left|\int\varphi\,d(\mu\lfloor\widetilde{F}_i - h_i\,\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)\right|.\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

For each $P \in \mathcal{W}_G$, since $\int g_P \, d\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma = \mu(P)$, we deduce that

$$\left| \int \varphi \, d(\mu\lfloor P - g_P \, \mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma) \right| \leq \left| \int_P (\varphi(x) - \varphi(x_P)) \, d\mu(x) \right| \\ + \left| \int (\varphi(x_P) - \varphi(x)) \, g_P(x) \, \mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma(x)) \right|.$$

To deal with the first integral on the right hand side we take into account that for $x \in P$ we have

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(x_P)| \leq \|\nabla\varphi\|_\infty \, |x - x_P| \leq c \, \ell(P). \tag{2.21}$$

Concerning the second integral, recall that $\operatorname{supp} g_P \subset \Gamma \cap \bar{B}(x_P, A \, \ell(P))$, and thus we also have $|x - x_P| \leq c \, \ell(P)$ in the domain of integration, so that (2.21) holds in this case too. Therefore,

$$\left| \int \varphi \, d(\mu\lfloor P - g_P \, \mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma) \right| \leq c \, \ell(P) \, \mu(P) \approx \int_P \operatorname{dist}(x, \Gamma) \, d\mu(x),$$

where we took into account that $\operatorname{dist}(x, \Gamma) \approx \ell(P)$ for every $x \in P$. Recall that $\operatorname{supp} \varphi \subset B_Q$ and thus the integral on the left hand side abovevanishes unless $P \cap B_Q \neq \varnothing$. As remarked in (2.6) this ensures that $P \subset 3B_Q$. Hence,

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{W}_G} \left| \int \varphi \, d(\mu\lfloor P - g_P \, \mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma) \right| \leq c \int_{3B_Q} \operatorname{dist}(x, \Gamma) \, d\mu(x). \tag{2.22}$$

To estimate the las term on the right hand side of (2.20) we argue analogously. For each $i \in I_H$, we have

$$\int h_i \, d\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \mathcal{W}_G : Q \sim \Delta_i} \mu(Q) + \mu(\widetilde{\Delta}_i \cap \Gamma) = \mu(\widetilde{F}_i),$$

and so

$$\left| \int \varphi \, d(\mu\lfloor \widetilde{F}_i - h_i \, \mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma) \right| \leq \left| \int_{\widetilde{F}_i} (\varphi(x) - \varphi(x_i)) \, d\mu(x) \right| \\ + \left| \int (\varphi(x_i) - \varphi(x)) \, h_i(x) \, \mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma(x)) \right|. \tag{2.23}$$

By (2.4) we know that

$$\widetilde{F}_i \cup \operatorname{supp} h_i \subset 3\Delta_i \cup \frac{1}{5}\Delta_i \subset 3\Delta_i. \tag{2.24}$$

So we have $|\varphi(x) - \varphi(x_i)| \leq c \, r(\Delta_i)$ in the integrals on the right hand side of (2.23) and thus we obtain

$$\left| \int \varphi \, d(\mu\lfloor \widetilde{F}_i - h_i \, \mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma) \right| \leq c \, r(\Delta_i) \, \mu(\widetilde{F}_i).$$

On the other hand, observe that the left side of (2.23) vanishes unless $\widetilde{F}_i \cap B_Q \neq \varnothing$ or $\frac{1}{5}\Delta_i \cap B_Q \neq \varnothing$. The first option implies that

$$\widetilde{F}_i \subset 3B_Q,$$

by (2.17). If $\frac{1}{5}\Delta_i \cap B_Q \neq \varnothing$, there exists also some $P \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \mathcal{W}_G$ which intersects both B_Q and Δ_i, which implies that $3\Delta_i \subset 3B_Q$ by (2.17) again. Together with (2.24) this yields

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\in I_H}\left|\int \varphi\, d(\mu\lfloor \widetilde{F}_i - h_i\,\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)\right| &\leq c \sum_{i:3\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} r(\Delta_i)\,\mu(\widetilde{F}_i)\\ &\leq c \sum_{i:3\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} r(\Delta_i)\,\mu(3\Delta_i)\\ &\leq c \sum_{i:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} r(\Delta_i)^{n+1}, \qquad (2.25)\end{aligned}$$

where we took into account that $\mu(3\Delta_i) \leq M\,3^n\,r(\Delta_i)^n$ in the last inequality.

From (2.20), (2.22) and (2.25), we derive

$$\left|\int \varphi\, d(\mu-\sigma)\right| \leq c\int_{3B_Q} \operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)\,d\mu(x) + c\sum_{i:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} r(\Delta_i)^{n+1}.$$

Plugging this estimate into (2.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int \varphi\,d\mu - c_Q\int \varphi\,d\mathcal{H}^1_{L_Q}\right| &\leq c\int_{3B_Q}\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)\,d\mu(x)\\ &\quad + c\sum_{i:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} r(\Delta_i)^{n+1} + \alpha_\sigma(Q)\,\ell(Q)^{n+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all 1-Lipschitz functions φ supported on B_Q, the lemma follows. □

Proof of Lemma 2.5. Obviously we may assume that $\mathcal{D}^G_\Gamma(R) \neq \varnothing$, which implies that $R \in \mathcal{D}^G_\Gamma$.

By Lemma 2.7, for any $R \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)} \alpha_\mu(Q)^2\,\ell(Q)^n \leq c &\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)} \alpha_\sigma(Q)^2\,\ell(Q)^n\\ &+ c\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)} \left(\int_{3B_Q} \frac{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)}{\ell(Q)^{n+1}}\,d\mu(x)\right)^2 \ell(Q)^n\\ &+ c\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)} \left(\sum_{i\in I_H:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} \left(\frac{r(\Delta_i)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{n+1}\right)^2 \ell(Q)^n. \qquad (2.26)\end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$\sigma = \mu\lfloor\Gamma + g\,\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma = \rho\,\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma + g\;\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma,$$

with $\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma)} \lesssim 1$. Then, by [To1], we have

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma(R)} \alpha_\sigma(Q)^2\,\ell(Q)^n \leq c\,\ell(R)^n. \qquad (2.27)$$

Let us turn our attention to the last term on the right hand side of (2.26). Using the estimate $r(\Delta_i) \leq c\,\ell(Q)$, we derive

$$\sum_{i\in I_H:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} \left(\frac{r(\Delta_i)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{n+1} \leq \frac{c}{\ell(Q)^n} \sum_{i\in I_H:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} r(\Delta_i)^n \lesssim 1.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)} &\left(\sum_{i\in I_H:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} \left(\frac{r(\Delta_i)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{n+1}\right)^2 \ell(Q)^n\\ &\lesssim \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma(R)}\ \sum_{i\in I_H:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} \left(\frac{r(\Delta_i)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{n+1} \ell(Q)^n\\ &\lesssim \sum_{i\in I_H:\Delta_i\subset cB_R} r(\Delta_i)^{n+1} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma:3B_Q\supset\Delta_i} \frac{1}{\ell(Q)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma:3B_Q\supset\Delta_i} \frac{1}{\ell(Q)} \lesssim \frac{1}{r(\Delta_i)},$$

we deduce that

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)} \left(\sum_{i\in I_H:\Delta_i\subset 3B_Q} \left(\frac{r(\Delta_i)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{n+1}\right)^2 \ell(Q)^n \lesssim \sum_{i\in I_H:\Delta_i\subset cB_R} r(\Delta_i)^n \lesssim \ell(R)^n,$$

taking into account that the balls $\frac{1}{5}\Delta_i$, $i \in I_H$, are disjoint.

To estimate the second term on the right side of (2.26) we use Cauchy-Schwarz:

$$\left(\int_{3B_Q} \frac{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)}{\ell(Q)^{n+1}}\,d\mu(x)\right)^2 \leq \mu(3B_Q)\int_{3B_Q}\left(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)}{\ell(Q)^{n+1}}\right)^2 d\mu(x).$$

Since $Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$, we have $\mu(3B_Q)\leq c\ell(Q)^n$, and so the right hand side of the above inequality does not exceed

$$c\int_{3B_Q}\frac{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)^2}{\ell(Q)^{n+2}}\,d\mu(x).$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)}\left(\int_{3B_Q}\frac{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)}{\ell(Q)^{n+1}}\,d\mu(x)\right)^2\ell(Q)^n$$
$$\leq c\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)}\int_{3B_Q}\frac{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)^2}{\ell(Q)^2}\,d\mu(x).$$

By Fubini, the term on the right hand side equals

$$\int_{c_6B_R}\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)^2\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)}\chi_{3B_Q}(x)\,\frac{1}{\ell(Q)^2}\,d\mu(x),$$

since

$$\bigcup_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma(R)}3B_Q\subset c_6B_R$$

for some constant $c_6>1$. Notice now that

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)}\chi_{3B_Q}(x)\,\frac{1}{\ell(Q)^2}=\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G:x\in 3B_Q,Q\subset R}\frac{1}{\ell(Q)^2}\lesssim\frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)^2},$$

because the condition $x\in 3B_Q$ implies that $\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)\leq r(B_Q)\approx\ell(Q)$. Thus,

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)}\left(\int_{3B_Q}\frac{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)}{\ell(Q)^{n+1}}\,d\mu(x)\right)^2\ell(Q)^n\lesssim\int_{c_6B_R}\frac{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)^2}{\operatorname{dist}(x,\Gamma)^2}\,d\mu(x)$$
$$=\mu(c_6B_R)\leq c\,\ell(R)^n.$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that $R\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$, and so R is not contained in H. Thus $B(x_R,\operatorname{diam}(c_6R))\not\subset H$ and then

$$\mu(c_6B_R)\leq M\,r(c_6B_R)^n\leq c\,M\,\ell(R)^n.$$

We have shown that the three terms on the right hand side of (2.26) are bounded by $c\,\ell(R)^n$, and so we are done. $\square$

2.5. **Proof of the Main Lemma 2.1.** We claim that for any $R \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$,

$$\int_{R\setminus H^9(M)} \int_0^{\ell(R)} \alpha_\mu(x,r)^2 \,\frac{dr}{r}\, d\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma(x) \leq c(M)\,\ell(R)^n. \tag{2.28}$$

This follows from the fact that given $x \in R \setminus H^9$ and $r \leq \ell(R)$, there exists some cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G$ with $\ell(Q) \approx r$ such that $B(x,r) \subset B_Q$, and so

$$\alpha_\mu(x,r) \lesssim \alpha_\mu(Q).$$

Then we obtain

$$\int_{R\setminus H^9(M)} \int_0^{\ell(R)} \alpha_\mu(x,r)^2 \,\frac{dr}{r}\, d\mathcal{H}^n_\Gamma(x) \lesssim \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_\Gamma^G(R)} \alpha_\mu(Q)^2\,\ell(Q)^n.$$

By Lemma 2.5, the right hand side above does not exceed $c(M)\,\ell(R)^n$, and thus we get (2.28). In particular, this estimate ensures that

$$\int_0^{\ell(R)} \alpha_\mu(x,r)^2 \,\frac{dr}{r} < \infty \qquad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in R \setminus H^9(M).$$

It easily follows then that

$$\int_0^{\infty} \alpha_\mu(x,r)^2 \,\frac{dr}{r} < \infty \qquad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in R \setminus H^9(M).$$

By Lemma 2.2, $\mathcal{H}^n(H^9(M)\cap\Gamma) \to 0$ as $M \to \infty$ and thus the preceding estimate holds $\mathcal{H}^n$-a.e. in R. As $R \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$ is arbitrary, we are done. $\square$

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

3.1. **Peliminaries.** The case $p = 1$ of Theorem 1.1 follows from the fact that

$$\beta_{\mu,1}(x,r) \leq c\,\alpha_\mu(x,2r) \quad \text{for all } x \in \operatorname{supp}\mu,\ r > 0. \tag{3.1}$$

To see this, take an n-plane $L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $a \geq 0$ which minimize $\alpha_\mu(x,2r)$, let φ be a Lipschitz function supported on $\bar{B}(x,2r)$ which equals 1 on $\bar{B}(x,r)$, with $\operatorname{Lip}(\varphi) \leq 1/r$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\bar{B}(x,r)} \operatorname{dist}(y,L)\,d\mu(y) &\leq \int_{\bar{B}(x,r)} \varphi(y)\operatorname{dist}(y,L)\,d\mu(y)\\ &= \left|\int \varphi(y)\operatorname{dist}(y,L)\,d(\mu - a\mathcal{H}^n|_L)(y)\right|\\ &\leq \operatorname{Lip}\big(\varphi\operatorname{dist}(\cdot,L)\big)\operatorname{dist}_{2B}(\mu, a\mathcal{H}^n|_L)\\ &\leq c\,r^{n+1}\,\alpha_\mu(x,2r),\end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.1).

Notice also that, for $1 \leq p < 2$, given a ball $B(x,r)$ and any n-plane L, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{r^n}\int_{\bar{B}(x,r)} &\left(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(y,L)}{r}\right)^p d\mu(y)\\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{r^n}\int_{\bar{B}(x,r)} \left(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(y,L)}{r}\right)^2 d\mu(y)\right)^{p/2} \left(\frac{\mu(\bar{B}(x,r))}{r^n}\right)^{1-p/2}.\end{aligned}$$

So taking infimums and raising to the power $1/p$, we obtain

$$\beta_{\mu,p}(x,r) \leq \left(\frac{\mu(\bar{B}(x,r))}{r^n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}} \beta_{\mu,2}(x,r).$$

As a consequence, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,p}(x,r)^2 \frac{dr}{r} \leq \left(\sup_{r>0} \frac{\mu(\bar{B}(x,r))}{r^n}\right)^{\frac{2}{p}-1} \int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,2}(x,r)^2 \frac{dr}{r}.$$

If μ is a finite Borel measure which is rectifiable, then the supremum on the right hand side above is finite for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. So to prove Theorem 1.1 it suffices to show that

$$\int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,2}(x,r)^2 \frac{dr}{r} < \infty \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.2}$$

To prove this statement we will follow an argument inspired by some techniques from [To1, Lemma 5.2], where it is shown that the $\beta_{\mu,2}$'s can be estimated in terms of the α_μ coefficients when μ is an n-dimensional AD-regular measure. In the present situation, μ fails to be AD-regular (in general) and so we will need to adapt the techniques in [To1] by suitable stopping time arguments.

3.2. **The stopping cubes.**

We denote by $\mathcal{D}$ the family of dyadic cubes from $\mathbb{R}^d$. Also, given $R \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{D}(R)$ stands for the cubes from $\mathcal{D}$ which are contained in R.

Since μ is n-rectifiable, the density

$$\Theta^n(x,\mu) = \lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{(2r)^n}$$

exists and is positive. So, given $R \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\mu(R) > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N > 0$ big enough such that

$$\mu\left(\{x \in R : \; N^{-1} \leq \Theta^n(x,\mu) \leq N\}\right) > (1-\varepsilon)\,\mu(R).$$

Let $r_0 > 0$ and denote now

$$A = A(N,r_0) = \{x \in R : \; N^{-1}\, r^n \leq \mu(B(x,r)) \leq 4N\, r^n \text{ for } 0 < r \leq r_0\}.$$

Then we infer that

$$\mu(R \setminus A) \leq 2\varepsilon$$

if r_0 is small enough.

By Theorem 1.3 we know that

$$\int_0^\infty \alpha_\mu(x,r)^2 \, \frac{dr}{r} < \infty.$$

So setting

$$F = F(N) = \left\{ x \in R \cap \operatorname{supp} \mu : \int_0^\infty \alpha_\mu(x,r)^2 \, \frac{dr}{r} \leq N \right\},$$

it turns out that

$$\mu(R \setminus F) \leq \varepsilon \, \mu(R)$$

if N is big enough.

We take N and r_0 so that

$$\mu(R \setminus (A \cap F)) \leq \mu(R \setminus A) + \mu(R \setminus F) \leq 3\varepsilon \, \mu(R). \tag{3.3}$$

For a given cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, we denote $B_Q = \bar{B}(x_Q, 3\mathrm{diam}(Q))$, where x_Q stands for the center of Q. Given some big constant $M > N$, we consider now the following subfamilies of cubes from $\mathcal{D}(R)$:

- We say that $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ belongs to HD_0 if $Q \subset 3R$, $\mathrm{diam}(Q) \leq r_0/10$ and $\mu(B_Q) \geq M \, \ell(Q)^n$.
- We say that $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ belongs to LD_0 if $Q \subset 3R$, $\mathrm{diam}(Q) \leq r_0/10$ and $\mu(3Q) \leq M^{-1} \, \ell(Q)^n$.
- We say that $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ belongs to BA_0 if $Q \subset 3R$, $\mathrm{diam}(Q) \leq r_0/10$, $Q \notin \mathsf{HD}_0 \cup \mathsf{LD}_0$, and $Q \cap F = \varnothing$.

We denote by Stop the family of maximal (and thus disjoint) cubes from $\mathsf{HD}_0 \cup \mathsf{LD}_0 \cup \mathsf{BA}_0$. We set $\mathsf{HD} = \mathrm{Stop} \cap \mathsf{HD}_0$, $\mathsf{LD} = \mathrm{Stop} \cap \mathsf{LD}_0$, and $\mathsf{BA} = \mathrm{Stop} \cap \mathsf{BA}_0$. The notations HD, LD, and BA stand for "high density", "low density", and "big alpha's", respectively.

Lemma 3.1. *For M big enough, we have*

$$R \cap \bigcup_{Q \in \mathrm{Stop}} Q \subset (R \setminus A) \cup (R \setminus F),$$

and thus

$$\mu\Bigg(R \cap \bigcup_{Q \in \mathrm{Stop}} Q \Bigg) \leq 3\varepsilon \, \mu(R).$$

Proof. Since the second statement is an immediate consequence of the first one, we only have to show that if $Q \in \mathcal{D}(R) \cap \mathrm{Stop}$, then $Q \subset (R \setminus A) \cup (R \setminus F)$.

Suppose first that $Q \in \mathsf{HD}$. Since for any $x \in Q$ we have $B_{Q_i} \subset B(x, 6\mathrm{diam}(Q))$, setting $r = 6\,\mathrm{diam}(Q)$ we get

$$\mu(B(x,r)) \geq \mu(B_Q) \geq M\,\ell(Q)^n = c_7\,M\,r^n > 4N\,r^n,$$

assuming $M > c_7^{-1}4N$. Since $r = \mathrm{diam}(6Q) \leq 6r_0/10 \leq r_0$, it turns out that $x \in A$. Hence $Q \subset R \setminus A$.

Consider now a cube $Q \in \mathsf{LD}$. Notice that $B(x, \ell(Q)) \subset 3Q$ for every $x \in Q$. Thus,

$$\mu\big(B(x, \ell(Q))\big) \leq \mu(3Q) \leq \frac{1}{M}\,\ell(Q)^n.$$

Thus, $x \in R \setminus A$ because $M > N$. So $Q \subset R \setminus A$.

Finally, if $Q \in \mathsf{BA}$, then $Q \cap F = \varnothing$ and thus $Q \subset R \setminus F$. □

We denote by $\mathcal{G}$ the subset of the cubes from $\mathcal{D}$ with $\mathrm{diam}(Q) \leq r_0/10$ which are not contained in any cube from Stop. We also set $\mathcal{G}(R) = \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{D}(R)$.

For a given cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, we denote

$$\alpha_\mu(Q) = \alpha_\mu(B_Q). \tag{3.4}$$

Recall that $B_Q = \bar{B}(x_Q, 3\mathrm{diam}(Q))$.

Lemma 3.2. *For all $x \in 3R \cap \operatorname{supp}\mu$, we have*

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}: x \in Q} \alpha_\mu(Q)^2 \leq c\,N.$$

Proof. Let $Q \in \mathcal{G}$ and $z \in Q \cap \operatorname{supp}\mu$. Since $B_Q \subset \bar{B}(z, 6\mathrm{diam}(Q))$, for any $r \in [6\,\mathrm{diam}(Q), 12\,\mathrm{diam}(Q)]$ we have

$$\alpha_\mu(Q) \leq c\,\alpha_\mu(z,r),$$

and thus

$$\alpha_\mu(Q)^2 \leq c \int_{6\mathrm{diam}(Q)}^{12\mathrm{diam}(Q)} \alpha_\mu(z,r)^2\,\frac{dr}{r}. \tag{3.5}$$

Given $x \in 3R \cap \operatorname{supp}\mu$, consider some cube $P \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $x \in P$. Since $P \notin \mathsf{BA}$, there exists some $z \in F \cap P$, and then from (3.5) we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}: Q \supset P} \alpha_\mu(Q)^2 &\leq c \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}: Q \supset P} \int_{6\mathrm{diam}(P)}^{12\mathrm{diam}(P)} \alpha_\mu(z,r)^2\,\frac{dr}{r} \\ &\leq c \int_0^\infty \alpha_\mu(z,r)^2\,\frac{dr}{r} \leq c\,N.\end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all $P \in \mathcal{G}$ which contains x, the lemma follows. □

3.3. **A key estimate.**

Lemma 3.3. *Let* $Q \in \mathcal{G}(R)$*. Let* L_Q *be the line minimizing* $\alpha(Q)$ *and* $x \in 3Q \cap \operatorname{supp}\mu$*. If there exists some* $S_x \in \mathrm{Stop}$ *such that* $x \in S_x$*, then set* $\ell_x = \ell(S_x)$*. Otherwise, set* $\ell_x = 0$*. We have*

$$\operatorname{dist}(x, L_Q) \leq c(M) \sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}: x \in P \subset 3Q} \alpha_\mu(P)\, \ell(P) + c\, \ell_x.$$

We will not prove this result in detail because the arguments are almost the same as the ones in Lemma 5.2 of [To1]. We just give a concise sketch.

Sketch of the proof. Let $x \in 3Q \cap \operatorname{supp}\mu$ and suppose that $\ell_x \neq 0$. For $i \geq 1$, denote by Q_i the dyadic cube with side length $2^{-i}\ell(Q)$ that contains x, so that Q_m is the parent of the cube S_x in the lemma, and $Q_i \in \mathcal{G}(R)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Set also $Q_0 = Q$. For $0 \leq i \leq m$, let L_{Q_i} be some n-plane minimizing $\alpha_\mu(Q_i)$ and denote by Π_i the orthogonal projection onto L_{Q_i}.

Let $x_m = \Pi_m(x)$, an by backward induction set $x_{i-1} = \Pi_{i-1}(x_i)$ for $i = m, \ldots, 1$. Then we set

$$\operatorname{dist}(x, L_Q) \leq |x_0 - x| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_{i-1} - x_i| + |x_m - x|. \tag{3.6}$$

It is clear that $|x_{m-1} - x| \lesssim \ell_x$, and one can check also that, for $1 \leq i \leq m$,

$$|x_{i-1} - x_i| \lesssim \operatorname{dist}_H(L_{Q_{i-1}} \cap B_{Q_i},\, L_{Q_i} \cap B_{Q_i}), \tag{3.7}$$

where dist_H stands for the Hausdorff distance. Further, it turns out that

$$\operatorname{dist}_H(L_{Q_{i-1}} \cap B_{Q_i},\, L_{Q_i} \cap B_{Q_i}) \lesssim \alpha_\mu(Q_i)\, \ell(Q_i), \tag{3.8}$$

with the implicit constant depending on M. This estimate has been proved in Lemma 3.4 of [To1] in the case when μ is AD-regular. It is not difficult to check that the same arguments also work for the cubes Q_i, $1 \leq i \leq m$, due to the fact that

$$M^{-1}\ell(Q_i)^n \leq \mu(3Q_i) \leq \mu(B_{Q_i}) \leq M\, \ell(Q_i)^n.$$

From (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8), the lemma follows. □

3.4. **Proof of** (3.2)**.** Given a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we set

$$\beta_{\mu,2}(Q) = \inf_L \left(\frac{1}{\ell(Q)^n} \int_{3Q} \left(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(y, L)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^2 d\mu(y) \right)^{1/2}, \tag{3.9}$$

where the infimum is taken over all n-planes $L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Instead, we could also have set $\beta_{\mu,2}(Q) = \beta_{\mu,2}(B_Q)$, analogously to the definition of $\alpha_\mu(Q)$ in (3.4). However, for technical reasons, the definition in (3.9) is more appropriate.

To prove (3.2) we will show first the next result.

Lemma 3.4. *The following holds:*

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}(R)} \beta_{\mu,2}(Q)^2 \, \mu(Q) \leq C(M, N) \, \mu(3R).$$

Proof. Consider a cube $Q \in \mathcal{G}(R)$. By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\operatorname{dist}(x, L_Q) \leq c(M) \sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}: x \in P \subset 3Q} \alpha_\mu(P) \, \ell(P) + c \, \ell_x.$$

where $\ell_x = \ell(S_x)$ if there exists $S_x \in \text{Stop}$ such that $x \in S_x$ and $\ell_x = 0$ otherwise. So we get

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dist}(x, L_Q)^2 &\leq c(M) \left(\sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}: x \in P \subset 3Q} \alpha_\mu(P) \, \ell(P) \right)^2 + c \, \ell_x^2 \\ &\leq c(M) \sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}: x \in P \subset 3Q} \alpha_\mu(P)^2 \, \ell(P) \ell(Q) + c \, \ell_x^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\mu,2}(Q)^2 &\lesssim_M \frac{1}{\ell(Q)^{n+2}} \int_{3Q} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}: P \subset 3Q} \alpha_\mu(P)^2 \, \ell(P) \ell(Q) \chi_P(x) \, d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\ell(Q)^{n+2}} \int_{3Q} \sum_{P \in \text{Stop}: P \subset 3Q} \ell(P)^2 \chi_P(x) \, d\mu(x) \\ &= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}: P \subset 3Q} \alpha_\mu(P)^2 \frac{\mu(P) \ell(P)}{\ell(Q)^{n+1}} + \sum_{P \in \text{Stop}: P \subset 3Q} \frac{\mu(P) \ell(P)^2}{\ell(Q)^{n+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}(R)} \beta_2(Q)^2 \, \mu(Q) &\lesssim_M \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}(R)} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}: P \subset 3Q} \alpha_\mu(P)^2 \frac{\mu(P) \, \ell(P) \, \mu(Q)}{\ell(Q)^{n+1}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}(R)} \sum_{P \in \text{Stop}: P \subset 3Q} \frac{\mu(P) \ell(P)^2 \, \mu(Q)}{\ell(Q)^{n+2}} =: I + II. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

First we deal with the term II. By Fubini, we have

$$II = \sum_{P\in \mathrm{Stop}} \mu(P)\,\ell(P)^2 \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{G}(R):3Q\supset P} \frac{\mu(Q)}{\ell(Q)^{n+2}}.$$

Since $\mu(Q)\leq M\,\ell(Q)^n$ for all $Q\in\mathcal{G}(R)$, the last sum above does not exceed $C(M)/\ell(P)^2$. Thus,

$$II \leq C(M)\sum_{P\in\mathrm{Stop}}\mu(P)\leq C(M)\,\mu(3R).$$

Finally, we turn our attention to the term I in (3.10):

$$I = \sum_{P\in\mathcal{G}:P\subset 3R} \alpha_\mu(P)^2\,\mu(P)\,\ell(P) \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{G}(R):3Q\supset P}\frac{\mu(Q)}{\ell(Q)^{n+1}}.$$

Using again that $\mu(Q)\leq M\,\ell(Q)^n$ for all $Q\in\mathcal{G}(R)$, we derive

$$I\leq c(M)\sum_{P\in\mathcal{G}:P\subset 3R}\alpha_\mu(P)^2\,\mu(P).$$

By Lemma 3.2, the sum on the right hand side above does not exceed $C(N)\,\mu(3R)$, and so the lemma follows. □

Now we can easily prove the estimate (3.2). Indeed, arguing as in Subsection 2.5, for some constant $c_8>0$ we get

$$\int_{A\cap F}\int_0^{c_8\,r_0}\beta_{\mu,2}(x,r)^2\,\frac{dr}{r}\leq c\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{G}(R)}\beta_{\mu,2}(Q)^2\,\mu(Q)\leq C(M,N)\,\mu(3R).$$

Thus

$$\int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,2}(x,r)^2\,\frac{dr}{r}<\infty\qquad\text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x\in A\cap F.$$

Recalling that, by (3.3), $\mu(R\setminus(A\cap F))\leq 3\varepsilon\,\mu(R)$ and that ε can be taken arbitrarily small, it turns out that

$$\int_0^\infty \beta_{\mu,2}(x,r)^2\,\frac{dr}{r}<\infty\qquad\text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x\in R.$$

Since this holds for any dyadic cube R with $\mu(R)>0$, (3.2) is proved.

REFERENCES

[ADT1] J. Azzam, G. David and T. Toro, *Wasserstein Distance and the Rectifiability of Doubling Measures: Part I*, Preprint (2014).

[ADT2] J. Azzam, G. David and T. Toro, *Wasserstein Distance and the Rectifiability of Doubling Measures: Part II*, Preprint (2014).

[AT] J. Azzam and X. Tolsa, *Characterization of n-rectifiability in terms of the Jones' square function: Part II*, Preprint (2014).

[BS1] M. Badger and R. Schul, *Multiscale analysis of 1-rectifiable measures: necessary conditions,* to appear in Math. Ann. (2014).

[BS2] M. Badger and R. Schul, *Two sufficient conditions for rectifiable measures*, Preprint (2014).

[CGLT] V. Chousionis, J. Garnett, T. Le and X. Tolsa, *Square functions and uniform rectifiability.* Preprint (2014). To appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.

[Da] G. David, *Unrectifiable* 1-*sets have vanishing analytic capacity.* Revista Mat. Iberoamericana 14(2) (1998), 369–479.

[DS1] G. David and S. Semmes, *Singular integrals and rectifiable sets in* $\mathbb{R}^n$*: Beyond Lipschitz graphs,* Astérisque No. 193 (1991).

[DS2] G. David and S. Semmes, *Analysis of and on uniformly rectifiable sets*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 38. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, (1993).

[Jo] P.W. Jones, *Rectifiable sets and the traveling salesman problem*, Invent. Math.102:1, (1990), 1–15.

[Lé] J.C. Léger. *Menger curvature and rectifiability.* Ann. of Math. 149 (1999), 831–869.

[Ler] G. Lerman. *Quantifying curvelike structures of measures by using* L^2 *Jones quantities.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 56(9) (2003), 1294–1365.

[Ma] P. Mattila. *Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces,* Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math. 44, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[MT] A. Mas and X. Tolsa, *Variation for Riesz transforms and uniform rectifiability,* J. Eur. Math. Soc. 16(11) (2014), 2267–2321

[NToV] F. Nazarov, X. Tolsa and A. Volberg, *On the uniform rectifiability of AD-regular measures with bounded Riesz transform operator: the case of codimension 1.* Acta Math. 213:2 (2014), 237–321.

[Pa] H. Pajot, *Conditions quantitatives de rectifiabilité*, Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France, Volume 125 (1997), 1–39.

[To1] X. Tolsa, *Uniform rectifiability, Calderón-Zygmund operators with odd kernel, and quasiorthogonality,* Proc. London Math. Soc. 98(2) (2009), 393–426.

[To2] X. Tolsa, *Principal values for Riesz transforms and rectifiability,* J. Funct. Anal. 254(7) (2008), 1811–1863.

[TT] X. Tolsa and T. Toro, *Rectifiability via a square function and Preiss' theorem.* To appear in Internat. Math. Res. Not.

Xavier Tolsa, ICREA and Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Catalonia